ESTTA Tracking number:

ESTTA689993 08/17/2015

Filing date:

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Proceeding	91222738
Party	Defendant PPP&C, Inc.
Correspondence Address	CHRISTOPHER CHATHAM CHATHAM & HOGAN, LLP 2312 W. OLIVE AVE., SUITE D BURBANK, CA 91506  chris@chathamhogan.com;jv@chathamhogan.
Submission	Answer
Filer's Name	Christopher Chatham
Filer's e-mail	chris@chathamhogan.com
Signature	/Christopher Chatham/
Date	08/17/2015
Attachments	Answer (081715).pdf(4519470 bytes )

# IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

In the Matter of Application Serial No.: 86/248555 Published in the *Official Gazette* on: March 10, 2015



Trademark:

International Flora Technologies, LTD.,	) U.S. Opposition No. 91222738
Opposer, v.	) I hereby certify that this correspondence and all marked attachments are being electronically filed with the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office through their website located at <a href="http://estta.uspto.gov">http://estta.uspto.gov</a> on:
PPP&C, Inc.,	) August 17,2015
Applicant.	Christopher (date) Chathan
	(name)

## ANSWER TO NOTICE OF OPPOSITION AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

Commissioner for Trademarks P.O. Box 1451 Alexandria, VA 22313-1451

Dear Sir:

PPP&C, Inc. ("Applicant") hereby answers the Notice of Opposition filed by International Flora Technologies LTD. ("Opposer") against registration of Applicant's mark



, U.S. Application Serial No. 86/248,555, as set forth below.

1. Answering Paragraph 1 of the Notice of Opposition, Applicant admits the allegations contained therein.

- 2. Answering Paragraph 2 of the Notice of Opposition, Applicant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein, and accordingly denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 2.
- 3. Answering Paragraph 3 of the Notice of Opposition, Applicant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein, and accordingly denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 3.
- 4. Answering Paragraph 4 of the Notice of Opposition, Applicant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein, and accordingly denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 4.
- 5. Answering Paragraph 5 of the Notice of Opposition, Applicant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein, and accordingly denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 5.
- 6. Answering Paragraph 6 of the Notice of Opposition, Applicant denies the allegations contained therein.
- 7. Answering Paragraph 7 of the Notice of Opposition, Applicant denies the allegations contained therein.
- 8. Answering Paragraph 8 of the Notice of Opposition, Applicant denies the allegations contained therein.
- 9. Answering Paragraph 9 of the Notice of Opposition, Applicant denies the allegations contained therein.

#### **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

Applicant alleges the following affirmative defenses:

### FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Applicant alleges that the Opposer is estopped from alleging confusion and cannot be damaged by the registration of Applicant's Mark as Opposer <u>failed</u> to oppose U.S. Application Serial No. 85/755310 for the mark "FLORA CELL" also owned by Applicant for the exact same goods as identified in Applicant's Mark which has since matured to registration. Moreover, as Applicant owns a registration for the mark "FLORA CELL" for the exact same goods as identified in the subject application, the case *Morehouse Mfg. Corp. v. J. Strickland & Co.*, 160 USPQ 715 (CCPA 1969) is analogous to this situation. In *Morehouse*, the court recognized that when an applicant owns a prior registration for the same mark identifying the same goods that are the subject mark and goods of the proposed application that "the opposer cannot be further injured because there already exists an injurious registration" and therefore an additional registration cannot cause injury. Such is also clearly the case here between the two marks "

"and "FLORA CELL" for the exact same goods. As Opposer declined to oppose Applicant's mark "FLORA CELL," Opposer's present opposition is without merit.

×

REVELATION

## SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Opposer's alleged *prime facie* rights, if any, based on its registrations are limited to the specific goods listed in Opposer's purported registrations and do not extend to any of the goods listed in Applicant's application.

## THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Applicant alleges that due to the significant differences between the parties' respective marks, there is no likelihood of confusion, mistake or deception between Applicant's Mark and the alleged marks of the Opposer.

#### FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The <u>only</u> element in common between Applicant's Mark and the marks alleged by Opposer is the term "flora." The term "flora" is a very weak term in relation to the goods allegedly offered by the Opposer, and cannot serve as a basis for a finding of a likelihood of confusion between the Applicant's Mark and the alleged marks of the Opposer. Applicant notes that there are <u>numerous</u> registrations for marks containing the term "flora" for cosmetics and related goods in Class 3 and chemicals for use in the manufacture of cosmetics in Class 1.

It is abundantly clear that the term "flora" is weak and should be afforded narrow rights due to the coexistence of Opposer's marks and the registrations listed in Tables A and B below. Applicant has listed over 30 different entities which have registrations containing the term "flora" for cosmetics and related goods in Class 3 and chemicals for use in the manufacture of cosmetics in Class 1.

It is evident that consumers and potential consumers are able to distinguish slight variations in a mark which contain the term "flora." Thus, the very existence of these "flora" containing registrations demonstrate there is no likelihood of confusion between Applicant's mark and Opposer's marks listed in the Opposition.

Table A, below, identifies a selection of marks that registered containing the term "flora" that were filed <u>after</u> at least one of Opposer's marks. In other words, although Opposer had a chance to oppose these "flora" marks, Opposer failed to do so. These actions – or lack thereof – are inconsistent with Opposer's current allegation that it will be damaged by the registration of



Applicant's

mark.

Table B, below, identifies a selection of registered marks containing the term "flora" that were filed <u>before</u> Opposer's marks. Thus, Opposer, which obtained its own "flora" marks over the earlier third party "flora" registrations in Table B, now appears to argue that it has exclusive rights to the term "flora" in at least Class 3 for cosmetics and related goods and chemicals for use in the manufacture of cosmetics in Class 1.

TABLE A

Mark	Class	Filing and Reg.	Reg. No.	Owner Name
FLORA AMERIÇA	3	February 19, 1993 September 28, 1993	1794610	Kingport Corporation
FLORACEUTICAL	1	June 27, 1994 April 1, 1997	2049467	Bio-Botanica, Inc.
FLORASANTOL	1	June 28, 1994 October 1, 1996	2004813	Takasago Koryo Kogyo Kabushiki Kaisha
FLORA	3, 5	September 23, 1994 September 3, 1996		Flora Manufacturing and Distributing Ltd.
TERRA FLORA	3	June 2, 1995 February 11, 1997	2037820	Rutledge, Michael
FLORANTONE	1	June 16, 1995 June 30, 1998		Takasago Koryo Kogyo Kabushiki Kaisha
FLORAMAT	1	November 24, 1997 January 12, 1999	2169852	Kao Kabushiki Kaisha
FLORACIDE	3	April 17, 1998 December 28, 1999	2304815	Pevonia International, LLC
ANGEL FLORA	3	May 21, 1999 March 14, 2000	2329716	Prasad Gifts, Inc.
FLORAE	3	June 15, 2000 October 9, 2001	2495965	Laboratoire Garnier & Cie L'Oreal and Pierre Feuillet
BHW HYDRO FLORA FIRMING MASK	3	October 6, 2000 July 2, 2002	2587607	Parrinello, Vincene
FLORASERUM	1	March 27, 2001 October 22, 2002	2638651	Bio-Botanica, Inc
FLORA D'ESSARTS	3	April 24, 2001 January 7, 2003	2671277	Flora D'Essarts

Mark	Class	Filing and Reg.	Reg. No.	Owner Name
FLORA-WAX	3	November 15, 2001 October 7, 2003	2772620	Pevonia International, LLC
BIO FLORA NATURAL BIO- FLORA	3	June 11, 2003 September 4, 2007	3287287	Communication & Marketing Corp.
FLORACTIVE	3, 5	April 26, 2004 January 24, 2006	3050967	Caster
FLORAME	3, 5, 9, 21	December 7, 2004 June 13, 2006	3104187	Florame
FLORA BELLA DE LALIQUE	3	March 4, 2005 April 4, 2006	3076944	Lalique Parfums SA
HAWAIIAN FLORA	3	May 11, 2007 August 4, 2009	3663984	Alexander, Tracey
SEAFLORA WILD ORGANIC SEAWEED SKINCARE	3	July 9, 2007 July 1, 2008	3459190	Bernard, Diane
FLORA BY GUCCI	3	August 2, 2007 May 26, 2009	3627732	Gucci America, Inc.
FLORA BY GUCCI	3	August 2, 2007 May 26, 2009	3627729	Gucci America, Inc.
FLORA-NUTRITIVE COMPLEX	3	August 24, 2007 February 24, 2009	3578564	BC International Cosmetic & Image Services, Inc
FLORACIL	3	March 27, 2009 December 8, 2009	3722696	Européenne De Produits De Beauté
AMAZONN FLORA	3	September 17, 2010 August 30, 2011	4018379	Rundle, Randy DBA Randy Rundle
LF LIQUIDFLORA	3, 35	September 5, 2011 November 20, 2012	4244018	Liquid Flora S.R.L.
FLORABELLE	3	October 12, 2011 February 18, 2014	4483281	Space Brands Limited
FLORABOTANICA BALENCIAGA	3	February 9, 2012 May 6, 2014	4526232	Balenciaga
FLORA MEDICA	3	May 23, 2012 February 26, 2013	4295014	Cooksley, Valerie
YELLOFLORA	3	May 28, 2012 August 27, 2013	4390531	Baxam, Deanna L.
ACQUAFLORA	3	May 31, 2012 February 24, 2015	4692781	Krenak Do Brasil Industria e Comercio De Cosmeticos Ltda
FLORA CELL	3	October 16, 2012	4580843	PPP&C, Inc.

Mark	Class	Filing and Reg.	Reg. No.	Owner Name
		August 5, 2014		
SEAFLORA	3	July 16, 2013 February 18, 2014	4485150	Bernard, Diane
FLORALISTA	3	August 30, 2013 April 15, 2014	4513195	Kenzo

#### TABLE B

Mark	Class	Filing and Reg.	Reg. No.	Owner Name
FLORALINE	3	September 30, 1952 June 16, 1953	0576116	Charabot & Co., Inc
FLORAFREE	3	April 21, 1980 December 20, 1983	1261389	DEB

WHEREFORE, Applicant prays that the Notice of Opposition be dismissed in its entirety, and that a registration issue to Applicant for its mark.

Respectfully submitted,

CHATHAM & HOGAN, LLP

Date: August 17, 2015

By: Christopher Chatham

2312 W. Olive Ave., Suite D

Burbank, CA 91506

Attorney for Applicant

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I served a copy of the foregoing <u>ANSWER TO NOTICE OF</u>

<u>OPPOSITION</u> upon Opposer's counsel by depositing one copy thereof in the United States

Mail, first-class postage prepaid, on August 17, 2015, addressed as follows:

Adam R. Stephenson, LTD. 40 W. Baseline Rd., Ste 101 Tempe, AZ 85283

Lia Dalirian